

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 18 are amended and new claims 27-28 are presented. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended and new claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration.

STATEMENT ON SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

An in-person interview was conducted on April 14, 2005 between the Applicants' representative and the Examiner. During the interview the Applicants' representative pointed out features of the present invention that patentably distinguish over the cited art. In addition, claim amendments were discussed to clarify the areas of storing and deriving information. Other points discussed are presented below.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the opportunity to conduct an in-person interview.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1 and 18 puts this application into condition for allowance and amendment of claims 1 and 18 and addition of new claims 27-28 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised. Independent claims 1 and 18 are amended, to recite, respectively an information management method and apparatus, using claim 1 as an example, "encrypting predetermined information that is stored in a predetermined secure area of a recording medium using medium-specific information or a key generated therefrom; storing the encrypted information in an area outside said secure area; and deriving said encrypted predetermined information outside said predetermined secure area."

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

ITEMS 10-12: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-17 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejects independent claims 1 (and dependent claims 2-17) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that "said medium-specific information" has insufficient antecedent basis. Independent claim 1 is amended herein to correct antecedence and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

ITEMS 13-14: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2 AND 11) UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HASEBE ET AL. (U.S.P. 5,392,351)

ITEMS 16-18 REJECTION OF DEPENDENT CLAIMS 3-10 AND 12-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS UNPATENTABLE OVER HASEBE IN VIEW OF COMBINATIONS OF SHEAR ET AL. (U.S. PUB. 2001/0042043) AND LANG (U.S.P. 5,191,611).

The Examiner rejects independent claim 1 (and dependent claims 2 and 11) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hasebe, and rejects dependent claims 3-10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Hasebe in view of combinations of Shear and Lang.

The rejections are traversed.

As discussed during the in-person interview, independent claim 1, as amended, recites an information management method "encrypting predetermined information that is stored in a predetermined secure area of a recording medium using-medium-specific information or a key generated therefrom; storing the encrypted information in an area outside said secure area; and deriving said encrypted predetermined information outside said predetermined secure area." (Emphasis added).

That is, according to aspects of the present invention, information, e.g., license information is taken outside the system and used as backup data. The encrypted license information that is stored in an area where a user can easily access such information, is encrypted with a key based on medium-specific information.

Upon needing recovery of license information by inputting the backup data into the system, the license information can be decrypted using a key based on the medium-specific information in the system and restored in the predetermined secure area of the system.

As discussed during the in-person interview, Hasebe does not teach a method of "storing the encrypted information in an area outside said secure area; and deriving said encrypted predetermined information outside said predetermined secure area."

Rather, Hasebe merely teaches that decryption is with a key based on medium-specific information in a system; a content use key is generated in a system; and a content is decrypted in a system, and not outside a predetermined secure area.

Conclusion

Since features of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-17 are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-17 allowed.

ITEMS 16-18: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS 19-24) UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER HASEBE IN VIEW OF COMBINATIONS OF SHEAR AND LANG

The Examiner rejects independent claim 18 (and claims 19-25 dependent thereon) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasebe in view of combinations of Shear and Lang.

The rejections are traversed.

Independent claim 18, as amended, recites an information management apparatus managing information of a recording medium "storing the encrypted information in an area outside said secure area; and deriving the stored encrypted information in an area outside said secure area."

As discussed during the in-person interview, Applicants submit that none of the cited art, alone or in combination, teach this feature. Rather, Hasebe merely teaches that content is decrypted in a system, and not outside a predetermined secure area. Further, there is no stated motivation to modify Hasebe to include such a feature

Conclusion

Since features recited by independent claim 18 (and dependent claims 19-26) are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination, and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 18-26 allowed.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 27-28 recite features of the present invention in an alternate fashion.

New dependent claims 27-28, using claim 27 as an example, recite, respectively, an information management method, and apparatus "wherein the area outside the secure area is external to the recording medium." (See, for example, page 15, lines 1-2).

These, and other, features of claims 27-28 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and they are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 15, 2005

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501